

AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS

The attached "Replacement Sheets" of drawings include changes to Figures 3, 4, 5 and 6. The attached "Replacement Sheets," which includes Figures 3, 4, 5 and 6, replaces the original sheets including Figures 3, 4, 5 and 6.

Attachment: Replacement Sheets

REMARKS

Claims 1-10, 12 are now pending in the application. Minor amendments have been made to the specification and some claims to simply overcome the objections to the specification and rejections of certain claims under 35 U.S.C. § 112. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

DRAWINGS

Applicant has attached revised drawings for the Examiner's approval. In the "Replacement Sheets" amendments are made to Figures 3, 4, 5 and 6. These changes are to correct minor errors and do not attempt to add any new subject matter.

The Examiner is kindly requested to consider and approve the revised drawings.

SPECIFICATION

Applicant has voluntarily amended the specification to correct minor errors without the addition of any new subject matter. The Examiner's approval of the specification amendments are respectfully requested.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 6-12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point and distinctly claim the subject matter which the Applicant regards as the invention. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Applicant has amended Claims 6 and 12 to delete the term "salisbury" which is not relevant to understanding of the claims. The Examiner is kindly requested to reconsider the rejection in view of the claim amendments.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 6-10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicant's Prior Art (APA) in view of Horvath (U.S. Pat. No. 3,643,968 and Takami (U.S. Pat. No. 4,508,072). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 6 has been amended to include the objected to limitations of Claim 11. As such, independent Claim 6 is now in condition for allowance as well as its dependent Claims 7-10. Claim 11 has been cancelled.

ALLOWABLE SUBJECT MATTER

The allowance of Claims 1-5 is acknowledged. Additionally, the Examiner states that Claim 11 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form. As noted, Applicant has amended Claim 6 to include the limitations of Claim 11 and any intervening claims. Therefore, Claim 6 should now be in condition for allowance. Likewise, Claim 12 has been amended to overcome the § 112 rejection.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1240.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: September 28, 2005

By: 

Philip E. Rettig, Reg. No. 34,000

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600

PER/lkb